



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

57

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/839,714	04/19/2001	Bo-In Lin	L&C2k01(09 / 839,714)	2769

7590 04/10/2003

Bo-In Lin  
13445 Mandoli Drive  
Los Altos Hills, CA 94022

EXAMINER

CHOW, MING

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2645

DATE MAILED: 04/10/2003

4

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

## Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/839,714

Applicant(s)

LIN, BO-IN

Examiner

Ming Chow

Art Unit

2645

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 19 April 2001.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-22 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-22 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

### Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) \_\_\_\_\_
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s) \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other:

***Drawings***

1. The drawings are objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a). The drawings must show every feature of the invention specified in the claims. Therefore, the "Internet Web site" cited in claim 7 must be shown as a portion of item 120 (unified access management center) of Fig. 2 in the specifications (see line 8-12 page 14 of the specifications), or the feature(s) canceled from the claim(s). No new matter should be entered. A proposed drawing correction or corrected drawings are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

2. The drawings are objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a). The drawings must show every feature of the invention specified in the claims. Therefore, the "database enabled sequential forwarding means" cited in claim 12 must be shown, or the feature(s) canceled from the claim(s). No new matter should be entered. A proposed drawing correction or corrected drawings are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

The changes made to 35 U.S.C. 102(e) by the American Inventors Protection Act of 1999 (AIPA) and the Intellectual Property and High Technology Technical Amendments Act of 2002 do not apply when the reference is a U.S. patent resulting directly or indirectly from an international application filed before November 29, 2000. Therefore, the prior art date of the reference is determined under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) prior to the amendment by the AIPA (pre-AIPA 35 U.S.C. 102(e)).

3. Claims 2-6, 10-14, 17, 19, 20 and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Rogers et al (US: 5946386).

For claims 2, 17, 19, 20 and 22, regarding “a message routing means.....of destinations”, Rogers et al teach on column 13 line 13-39 call routing.

Regarding “a database.....destination number”, Rogers et al teach on column 3 line 16-20. The “one number “ of Rogers et al is the claimed “unified access number” (one number to send voice, fax and data calls). Rogers et al also teach on column 9 line 1-11 call management database includes caller identification information. As Rogers et al teach on column 3 line 16-20

Art Unit: 2645

the “one number” is used to identify the caller. Therefore, the “one number” must be included in the call management database. Rogers et al teach on column 2 line 21-35 VIP rules for transferring calls (reads on the claimed “forwarding destination number”). Since the call management database includes the VIP rules (of transferring calls), the forwarding destination numbers must be included in the call management database.

Regarding “said database further.....list of callers”, Rogers et al teach on column 25 line 56-60 the called party uses call control window (claimed “user interface”) to edit the primary caller ID database (of the call management databases).

Regarding claim 3, Rogers et al teach on Fig. 2 call management computer (claimed “unified access management center”).

Regarding claims 4 and 5, Rogers et al teach on column 37 line 47-51 the user may change his “one number”. Rogers et al also teach on column 44 line 19-21 the system user may call his own “one number” and enter a password for access authorization. This system of Rogers et al must register the system user in order to verify the entered password. The entering a password reads on the claimed “logging”.

Regarding claim 6, Rogers et al teach on column 3 line 15-20 the “one number” is single unique telephone number to each user. Since the VIP rule of forwarding a call is based on the identity of the calling party (the “one number”), there must be a second forwarding destination number associated with a second caller.

Regarding claim 10, Rogers et al teach on column 38 line 47-48 rules of forwarding sequence of a FAX.

Regarding claim 11, Rogers et al teach on column 38 line 44-46 rules of time-dependent forwarding sequence.

Regarding claim 12, the sequential forwarding processes (as rejections stated in claims 10 and 11 above) taught by Rogers et al are based on rules stored in the call management database. The sequential forwarding taught by Rogers et al must be enabled by the database.

Regarding claim 13, Rogers et al teach on column 22 line 16-26 real-time control of calls, call transfers and call forwarding. The “real-time control” of Rogers et al reads on the claimed “simultaneous”.

Regarding claim 14, Rogers et al teach on column 22 line 18 e-mail is also one of message types supported by the Roger’s system.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

Art Unit: 2645

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rogers et al, and in view of Junkin (US: 6493717), Lombardo (US: 6341290) and Yamaguchi (US: 6499055).

Regarding "a message.....of destinations" and "a unified access.....destination numbers", the rejections as stated in claim 2 above apply.

Regarding "a unified access.....destination numbers", the rejections as stated in claim 2 above apply.

Rogers et al failed to teach "Unified access management center.....lists of callers". However, Junkin teaches on column 2 line 65 to column 3 line 17 editing a database via an HTML-based internet browser.

Rogers et al failed to teach "unified access management.....number to said database". However, the rejections as stated in claim 8 apply.

Rogers et al failed to teach "user access control.....editing said database". However, the rejections as stated in claim 9 apply.

Rogers et al failed to teach "unified access management.....(e-mail) message". However, the rejections as stated in claim 7 apply.

It would have been obvious to one skilled at the time the invention was made to modify Rogers et al to have the "Unified access management center.....lists of callers", "unified access management.....number to said database", "user access control.....editing said database" and "unified access management.....(e-mail) message" as taught by Junkin, Lombardo and

Art Unit: 2645

Yamaguchi such that the modified system of Rogers et al would be able to support the internet-web user interface for editing database, user-access control means, user-logging in means, and telephone message processor to the system users.

5. Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rogers et al as applied to claimed 2 above, and in view of Yamaguchi (US: 6499055). Rogers et al failed to teach “unified access.....(e-mail) message”. However, Yamaguchi teaches on column 4 line 4-12 a WWW server for receiving and processing e-mails. It would have been obvious to one skilled at the time the invention was made to modify Rogers et al to have the “unified access.....(e-mail) message” as taught by Yamaguchi such that the modified system of Rogers et al would be able to support the web site to the system users.

6. Claims 8 and 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rogers et al as applied to claimed 3 above, and in view of Lombardo et al (US: 6341290). Rogers et al failed to teach “unified access.....to said database” and “unified access.....editing said database”. However, Lombardo et al teach on column 8 line 32-40 access control by using a web page for login. It would have been obvious to one skilled at the time the invention was made to modify Rogers et al to have the “unified access.....to said database” and “unified access.....editing said database” as taught by Lombardo et al such that the modified system of Rogers et al would be able to support the web site to the system users.



Art Unit: 2645

7. Claim 15 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rogers et al as applied to claimed 2 above, and in view of Porter (US: 6282270). Rogers et al failed to teach "database further comprising.....destination URL". However, Porter teaches on Abstract that voice messages are forwarded from the WWW server to its client. The URL of the www client must be stored on the system. It would have been obvious to one skilled at the time the invention was made to modify Rogers et al to have the "database further comprising.....destination URL" as taught by Porter such that the modified system of Rogers et al would be able to support the URL to the system users.

8. Claims 16, 18 and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rogers et al as applied to claimed 10 above, and in view of Seraj (US: 6535745). Rogers et al failed to teach "a user presence identifying.....caller lists". However, Seraj teaches on column 1 line 51-64 HLR and VLR are updated based on the mobile station's location (see line 23-25, page 10 of the specifications). It would have been obvious to one skilled at the time the invention was made to modify Rogers et al to have the "a user presence identifying.....caller lists" as taught by Seraj such that the modified system of Rogers et al would be able to support the user presence identifying means to the system users.

### *Conclusion*

Art Unit: 2645

9. The prior art made of record and not replied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

- Fleischer et al (US: 5592541) teach apparatus and method for forwarding incoming calls.

10. Any inquiry concerning this application and office action should be directed to the examiner Ming Chow whose telephone number is (703) 305-4817. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 8:30 am to 5 pm. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Fan Tsang, can be reached on (703) 305-4895. Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Customer Service whose telephone number is (703) 306-0377. Any response to this action should be mailed to:

**Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks**

**Washington, D.C. 20231**

**Or faxed to TC2600's Customer Service FAX Number 703-872-9314.**

Patent Examiner

Art Unit 2645

Ming Chow



FAN TSANG  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600

